

HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL
TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI 2005–2010

RC-Specific Evaluation of CulCap – Cultural Capital and Social Stratification

Seppo Saari & Antti Moilanen (Eds.)



Evaluation Panel: Social Sciences

INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL
TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI 2005–2010

RC-Specific Evaluation of CulCap – Cultural Capital and Social Stratification

Seppo Saari & Antti Moilanen (Eds.)

University of Helsinki
Administrative Publications 80/129
Evaluations
2012

Publisher:
University of Helsinki

Editors:
Seppo Saari & Antti Moilanen

Title: International Evaluation of Research and Doctoral Training at the University of Helsinki 2005–2010 : RC-Specific Evaluation of CulCap – Cultural Capital and Social Stratification		Type of publication: Evaluations
Summary: Researcher Community (RC) was a new concept of the participating unit in the evaluation. Participation in the evaluation was voluntary and the RCs had to choose one of the five characteristic categories to participate. Evaluation of the Researcher Community was based on the answers to the evaluation questions. In addition a list of publications and other activities were provided by the TUHAT system. The CWTS/Leiden University conducted analyses for 80 RCs and the Helsinki University Library for 66 RCs. Panellists, 49 and two special experts in five panels evaluated all the evaluation material as a whole and discussed the feedback for RC-specific reports in the panel meetings in Helsinki. The main part of this report is consisted of the feedback which is published as such in the report. Chapters in the report: 1. Background for the evaluation 2. Evaluation feedback for the Researcher Community 3. List of publications 4. List of activities 5. Bibliometric analyses The level of the RCs' success can be concluded from the written feedback together with the numeric evaluation of four evaluation questions and the category fitness. More conclusions of the success can be drawn based on the University-level report.		
RC-specific information:		
Main scientific field of research: Social Sciences	RC-specific keywords: Cultural capital, distinction, social stratification	
Participation category: 4. Research of the participating community represents an innovative opening		
RC's responsible person: Rahkonen, Keijo		
Keywords: Research Evaluation, Meta-evaluation, Doctoral Training, Bibliometric Analyses, Researcher Community		

Series title and number: University of Helsinki, Administrative Publications 80/129, Evaluations	
ISSN: 1795-5513 (Online)	ISBN: 978-952-10-7549-0 (PDF)
Total number of pages: 60	Language: English
Additional information: Cover graphics: Päivi Talonpoika-Ukkonen Enquiries: seppo.o.saari@helsinki.fi	Internet address: http://www.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/aineisto/rc_evaluation_2012/hallinnon_julkaisu_80_129_2012.pdf

Contents

Panel members	1
1 Introduction to the Evaluation	5
1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports	5
1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation	5
1.3 Evaluation method	5
1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation	6
1.5 Evaluation material	7
1.6 Evaluation questions and material	8
1.7 Evaluation criteria	10
1.8 Timetable of the evaluation	13
1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel	13
2 Evaluation feedback.....	15
2.1 Focus and quality of the RC's research	15
2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training	15
2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training.....	15
2.4 International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility	16
2.5 Operational conditions	16
2.6 Leadership and management in the researcher community	16
2.7 External competitive funding of the RC	17
2.8 The RC's strategic action plan for 2011–2013	17
2.9 Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)	17
2.10 Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material ...	17
2.11 How the UH's focus areas are presented in the RC's research	17
2.12 RC-specific main recommendations	18
2.13 RC-specific conclusions	18
3 Appendices	19

Foreword

The evaluation of research and doctoral training is being carried out in the years 2010–2012 and will end in 2012. The steering group appointed by the Rector in January 2010 set the conditions for participating in the evaluation and prepared the Terms of Reference to present the evaluation procedure and criteria. The publications and other scientific activities included in the evaluation covered the years 2005–2010.

The participating unit in the evaluation was defined as a Researcher Community (RC). To obtain a critical mass with university-level impact, the number of members was set to range from 20 to 120. The RCs were required to contain researchers in all stages of their research career, from doctoral students to principal investigators (PIs). All in all, 136 Researcher Communities participated in this voluntary evaluation, 5857 persons in total, of whom 1131 were principal investigators. PIs were allowed to participate in two communities in certain cases, and 72 of them used this opportunity and participated in two RCs.

This evaluation enabled researchers to define RCs from the “bottom up” and across disciplines. The aim of the evaluation was not to assess individual performance but a community with shared aims and researcher-training activities. The RCs were able to choose among five different categories that characterised the status and main aims of their research. The steering group considered the process of applying to participate in the evaluation to be important, which led to the establishment of these categories. In addition, providing a service for the RCs to enable them to benchmark their research at the global level was a main goal of the evaluation.

The data for the evaluation consisted of the RCs’ answers to evaluation questions on supplied e-forms and a compilation extracted from the TUHAT – Research Information System (RIS) on 12 April 2011. The compilation covered scientific and other publications as well as certain areas of scientific activities. During the process, the RCs were asked to check the list of publications and other scientific activities and make corrections if needed. These TUHAT compilations are public and available on the evaluation project sites of each RC in the TUHAT-RIS.

In addition to the e-form and TUHAT compilation, University of Leiden (CWTS) carried out bibliometric analyses from the articles included in the Web of Science (WoS). This was done on University and RC levels. In cases where the publication forums of the RC were clearly not represented by the WoS data, the Library of the University of Helsinki conducted a separate analysis of the publications. This was done for 66 RCs representing the humanities and social sciences.

The evaluation office also carried out an enquiry targeted to the supervisors and PhD candidates about the organisation of doctoral studies at the University of Helsinki. This and other documents describing the University and the Finnish higher education system were provided to the panellists.

The panel feedback for each RC is unique and presented as an entity. The first collective evaluation reports available for the whole panel were prepared in July–August 2011. The reports were accessible to all panel members via the electronic evaluation platform in August. Scoring from 1 to 5 was used to complement written feedback in association with evaluation questions 1–4 (scientific focus and quality, doctoral training, societal impact, cooperation) and in addition to the category evaluating the fitness for participation in the evaluation. Panellists used the international level as a point of comparison in the evaluation. Scoring was not expected to go along with a preset deviation.

Each of the draft reports were discussed and dealt with by the panel in meetings in Helsinki (from 11 September to 13 September or from 18 September to 20 September 2011). In these meetings the panels also examined the deviations among the scores and finalised the draft reports together.

The current RC-specific report deals shortly with the background of the evaluation and the terms of participation. The main evaluation feedback is provided in the evaluation report, organised according to the evaluation questions. The original material provided by the RCs for the panellists has been attached to these documents.

On behalf of the evaluation steering group and office, I sincerely wish to thank you warmly for your participation in this evaluation. The effort you made in submitting the data to TUHAT-RIS is gratefully acknowledged by the University. We wish that you find this panel feedback useful in many ways. The bibliometric profiles may open a new view on your publication forums and provide a perspective for discussion on your choice of forums. We especially hope that this evaluation report will help you in setting the future goals of your research.

Johanna Björkroth
Vice-Rector
Chair of the Steering Group of the Evaluation

Steering Group of the evaluation

Steering group, nominated by the Rector of the University, was responsible for the planning of the evaluation and its implementation having altogether 22 meetings between February 2010 and March 2012.

Chair

Vice-Rector, professor **Johanna Björkroth**

Vice-Chair

Professor **Marja Airaksinen**

Chief Information Specialist, Dr **Maria Forsman**

Professor **Arto Mustajoki**

University Lecturer, Dr **Kirsi Pyhältö**

Director of Strategic Planning and Development, Dr **Ossi Tuomi**

Doctoral candidate, MSocSc **Jussi Vauhkonen**

Panel members

CHAIR

Professor Hebe Vessuri

Social anthropology
Venezuelan Institute of Scientific Research, Venezuela

VICE-CHAIR

Professor Christine Heim

Psychology, neurobiology of early-life stress, depression, anxiety, functional somatic disorders
Charité University Medicine Berlin, Germany

Professor Allen Ketcham

Ethics and social philosophy, applied Social philosophy, ethics of business
Texas A&M University – Kingsville, USA

Professor Erno Lehtinen

Education, educational reform
University of Turku, Finland

Professor Enzo Mingione

Urban sociology
University of Milan - Bicocca, Italy

Professor Giovanna Procacci

Political sociology, transformation of citizenship, social rights, social exclusion, immigration policy
University of Milan, Italy

Professor Inger Johanne Sand

Law, public law, legal theory
University of Oslo, Norway

Professor Timo Teräsvirta

Time series econometrics
Aarhus University, Denmark

Professor Göran Therborn

General sociology
University of Cambridge, Great Britain

Professor Liisa Uusitalo

Consumer behaviour (economic & social theory), marketing and communication research
Aalto University, School of Economics, Finland

The panel, independently, evaluated all the submitted material and was responsible for the feedback of the RC-specific reports. The panel members were asked to confirm whether they had any conflict of interests with the RCs. If this was the case, the panel members disqualified themselves in discussion and report writing.

Added expertise to the evaluation was contributed by two members from the Panel of Humanities.

Experts from the Panel of Humanities

Professor Erhard Hinrichs

Professor Pauline von Bonsdorff

EVALUATION OFFICE

Dr Seppo Saari, Doc., Senior Adviser in Evaluation, was responsible for the entire evaluation, its planning and implementation and acted as an Editor-in-chief of the reports.

Dr Eeva Sievi, Doc., Adviser, was responsible for the registration and evaluation material compilations for the panellists. She worked in the evaluation office from August 2010 to July 2011.

MSocSc Paula Ranne, Planning Officer, was responsible for organising the panel meetings and all the other practical issues like agreements and fees and editing a part the RC-specific reports. She worked in the evaluation office from March 2011 to January 2012.

Mr Antti Moilanen, Project Secretary, was responsible for editing the reports. He worked in the evaluation office from January 2012 to April 2012.

TUHAT OFFICE

Provision of the publication and other scientific activity data

Mrs Aija Kaitera, Project Manager of TUHAT-RIS served the project ex officio providing the evaluation project with the updated information from TUHAT-RIS. The TUHAT office assisted in mapping the publications with CWTS/University of Leiden.

MA Liisa Ekebon, Assisting Officer, served in TUHAT-RIS updating the publications for the evaluation. She also assisted the UH/Library analyses.

BA Liisa Jäppinen, Assisting Officer, served in TUHAT-RIS updating the publications for the evaluation.

HELSINKI UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Provision of the publication analyses

Dr Maria Forsman, Chief Information Specialist in the Helsinki University Library, managed with her 10 colleagues the bibliometric analyses in humanities, social sciences and in other fields of sciences where CWTS analyses were not applicable.

Acronyms and abbreviations applied in the report

External competitive funding

AF – Academy of Finland
TEKES - Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation
EU - European Union
ERC - European Research Council
International and national foundations
FP7/6 etc. /Framework Programmes/Funding of European Commission

Evaluation marks

Outstanding (5)
Excellent (4)
Very Good (3)
Good (2)
Sufficient (1)

Abbreviations of Bibliometric Indicators

P - Number of publications
TCS – Total number of citations
MCS - Number of citations per publication, excluding self-citations
PNC - Percentage of uncited publications
MNCS - Field-normalized number of citations per publication
MNJS - Field-normalized average journal impact
THCP10 - Field-normalized proportion highly cited publications (top 10%)
INT_COV - Internal coverage, the average amount of references covered by the WoS
WoS – Thomson Reuters Web of Science Databases

Participation category

Category 1. The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.
Category 2. The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.
Category 3. The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation.
Category 4. The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening.
Category 5. The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact.

Research focus areas of the University of Helsinki

Focus area 1: The basic structure, materials and natural resources of the physical world
Focus area 2: The basic structure of life
Focus area 3: The changing environment – clean water
Focus area 4: The thinking and learning human being
Focus area 5: Welfare and safety
Focus area 6: Clinical research
Focus area 7: Precise reasoning
Focus area 8: Language and culture
Focus area 9: Social justice
Focus area 10: Globalisation and social change

1 Introduction to the Evaluation

1.1 RC-specific evaluation reports

The participants in the evaluation of research and doctoral training were Researcher Communities (hereafter referred to as the RC). The RC refers to the group of researchers who registered together in the evaluation of their research and doctoral training. Preconditions in forming RCs were stated in the Guidelines for the Participating Researcher Communities. The RCs defined themselves whether their compositions should be considered well-established or new.

It is essential to emphasise that the evaluation combines both meta-evaluation¹ and traditional research assessment exercise and its focus is both on the research outcomes and procedures associated with research and doctoral training. The approach to the evaluation is enhancement-led where self-evaluation constituted the main information. The answers to the evaluation questions formed together with the information of publications and other scientific activities an entity that was to be reviewed as a whole.

The present evaluation recognizes and justifies the diversity of research practices and publication traditions. Traditional Research Assessment Exercises do not necessarily value high quality research with low volumes or research distinct from mainstream research. It is challenging to expose the diversity of research to fair comparison. To understand the essence of different research practices and to do justice to their diversity was one of the main challenges of the present evaluation method. Understanding the divergent starting points of the RCs demanded sensitivity from the evaluators.

1.2 Aims and objectives in the evaluation

The aims of the evaluation are as follows:

- to improve the level of research and doctoral training at the University of Helsinki and to raise their international profile in accordance with the University's strategic policies. The improvement of doctoral training should be compared to the University's policy.²
- to enhance the research conducted at the University by taking into account the diversity, originality, multidisciplinary nature, success and field-specificity,
- to recognize the conditions and prerequisites under which excellent, original and high-impact research is carried out,
- to offer the academic community the opportunity to receive topical and versatile international peer feedback,
- to better recognize the University's research potential.
- to exploit the University's TUHAT research information system to enable transparency of publishing activities and in the production of reliable, comparable data.

1.3 Evaluation method

The evaluation can be considered as an enhancement-led evaluation. Instead of ranking, the main aim is to provide useful information for the enhancement of research and doctoral training of the participating RCs. The comparison should take into account each field of science and acknowledge their special character.

¹ The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics or comparable analyses.

² [Policies on doctoral degrees and other postgraduate degrees at the University of Helsinki.](#)

The comparison produced information about the present status and factors that have lead to success. Also challenges in the operations and outcomes were recognized.

The evaluation approach has been designed to recognize better the significance and specific nature of researcher communities and research areas in the multidisciplinary top-level university. Furthermore, one of the aims of the evaluation is to bring to light those evaluation aspects that differ from the prevalent ones. Thus the views of various fields of research can be described and research arising from various starting points understood better. The doctoral training is integrated into the evaluation as a natural component related to research. Operational processes of doctoral training are being examined in the evaluation.

Five stages of the evaluation method were:

1. Registration – Stage 1
2. Self-evaluation – Stage 2
3. TUHAT³ compilations on publications and other scientific activities⁴
4. External evaluation
5. Public reporting

1.4 Implementation of the external evaluation

Five Evaluation Panels

Five evaluation panels consisted of independent, renowned and highly respected experts. The main domains of the panels are:

1. biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences
2. medicine, biomedicine and health sciences
3. natural sciences
4. humanities
5. social sciences

The University invited 10 renowned scientists to act as chairs or vice-chairs of the five panels based on the suggestions of faculties and independent institutes. Besides leading the work of the panel, an additional role of the chairs was to discuss with other panel chairs in order to adopt a broadly similar approach. The panel chairs and vice-chairs had a pre-meeting on 27 May 2011 in Amsterdam.

The panel compositions were nominated by the Rector of the University 27 April 2011. The participating RCs suggested the panel members. The total number of panel members was 50. The reason for a smaller number of panellists as compared to the previous evaluations was the character of the evaluation as a meta-evaluation. The panellists did not read research reports or abstracts but instead, they evaluated answers to the evaluation questions, tables and compilations of publications, other scientific activities, bibliometrics and comparable analyses.

The panel meetings were held in Helsinki:

- On 11–13 September 2011: (1) biological, agricultural and veterinary sciences, (2) medicine, biomedicine and health sciences and (3) natural sciences.
- On 18–20 September 2011: (4) humanities and (5) social sciences.

³ TUHAT (acronym) of Research Information System (RIS) of the University of Helsinki

⁴ Supervision of thesis, prizes and awards, editorial work and peer reviews, participation in committees, boards and networks and public appearances.

1.5 Evaluation material

The main material in the evaluation was the RCs' self-evaluations that were qualitative in character and allowed the RCs to choose what was important to mention or emphasise and what was left unmentioned.

The present evaluation is exceptional at least in the Finnish context because it is based on both the evaluation documentation (self-evaluation questions, publications and other scientific activities) and the bibliometric reports. All documents were delivered to the panellists for examination.

Traditional bibliometrics can be reasonably done mainly in medicine, biosciences and natural sciences when using the Web of Science database, for example. Bibliometrics, provided by CWTS/The Centre for Science and Technology Studies, University of Leiden, cover only the publications that include WoS identification in the TUHAT-RIS.

Traditional bibliometrics are seldom relevant in humanities and social sciences because the international comparable databases do not store every type of high quality research publications, such as books and monographs and scientific journals in other languages than English. The Helsinki University Library has done analysis to the RCs, if their publications were not well represented in the Web of Science databases (RCs should have at least 50 publications and internal coverage of publications more than 40%) – it meant 58 RCs. The bibliometric material for the evaluation panels was available in June 2011. The RC-specific bibliometric reports are attached at the end of each report.

The panels were provided with the evaluation material and all other necessary background information, such as the basic information about the University of Helsinki and the Finnish higher education system.

Evaluation material

1. Registration documents of the RCs for the background information
2. Self evaluation material – answers to the evaluation questions
3. Publications and other scientific activities based on the TUHAT RIS:
 - 3.1. statistics of publications
 - 3.2. list of publications
 - 3.3. statistics of other scientific activities
 - 3.4. list of other scientific activities
4. Bibliometrics and comparable analyses:
 - 4.1. Analyses of publications based on the verification of TUHAT-RIS publications with the Web of Science publications (CWTS/University of Leiden)
 - 4.2. Publication statistics analysed by the Helsinki University Library - mainly for humanities and social sciences
5. University level survey on doctoral training (August 2011)
6. University level analysis on publications 2005–2010 (August 2011) provided by CWTS/University of Leiden

Background material

University of Helsinki

- [Basic information about the University of the Helsinki](#)
- [The structure of doctoral training at the University of Helsinki](#)
- Previous evaluations of research at the University of Helsinki – links to the reports: [1998](#) and [2005](#)

The Finnish Universities/Research Institutes

- [Finnish University system](#)
- [Evaluation of the Finnish National Innovation System](#)
- [The State and Quality of Scientific Research in Finland. Publication of the Academy of Finland 9/09.](#)

The evaluation panels were provided also with other relevant material on request before the meetings in Helsinki.

1.6 Evaluation questions and material

The participating RCs answered the following evaluation questions which are presented according to the evaluation form. In addition, TUHAT RIS was used to provide the **additional material** as explained. For giving the feedback to the RCs, the panellists received the evaluation feedback form constructed in line with the evaluation questions:

1. Focus and quality of the RC's research

- Description of
 - the RC's research focus.
 - the quality of the RC's research (incl. key research questions and results)
 - the scientific significance of the RC's research in the research field(s)
- Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC's research

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC's publications, analysis of the RC's publications data (provided by University of Leiden and the Helsinki University Library)

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

2. Practises and quality of doctoral training

- Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC's principles for:
 - recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates
 - supervision of doctoral candidates
 - collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes
 - good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training
 - assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates
- Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC's other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations

A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

3. The societal impact of research and doctoral training

- Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).
- Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC's research and doctoral training.

The additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC's other scientific activities.

A written feedback from the aspects of: societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

4. International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

- Description of
 - the RC's research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities
 - how the RC has promoted researcher mobility
- Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, national and international collaboration

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

5. Operational conditions

- Description of the operational conditions in the RC's research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).
- Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

A written feedback from the aspects of: processes and good practices related to leadership and management

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

6. Leadership and management in the researcher community

- Description of
 - the execution and processes of leadership in the RC
 - how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC
 - how the leadership- and management-related processes support
 - high quality research
 - collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC
 - the RC's research focus
 - strengthening of the RC's know-how
- Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes

7. External competitive funding of the RC

- The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:
 - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
 - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki
- On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:
 - 1) The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organisations), and
 - 2) The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010.

Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness, future significance

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

8. The RC's strategic action plan for 2011-2013

- RC's description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.

A written feedback from the aspects of: scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance

- Strengths
- Areas of development

- Other remarks
- Recommendations

9. Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC's fitness to the chosen participation category

A written feedback evaluating the RC's fitness to the chosen participation category

- Strengths
- Areas of development
- Other remarks
- Recommendations

Numeric evaluation: OUTSTANDING (5), EXCELLENT (4), VERY GOOD (3), GOOD (2), SUFFICIENT (1)

10. Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material

Comments on the compilation of evaluation material

11. How the UH's focus areas are presented in the RC's research?

Comments if applicable

12. RC-specific main recommendations based on the previous questions 1-11

13. RC-specific conclusions

1.7 Evaluation criteria

The panellists were expected to give evaluative and analytical feedback to each evaluation question according to their aspects in order to describe and justify the quality of the submitted material. In addition, the evaluation feedback was asked to be pointed out the level of the performance according to the following classifications:

- outstanding (5)
- excellent (4)
- very good (3)
- good (2)
- sufficient (1)

Evaluation according to the criteria was to be made with thorough consideration of the entire evaluation material of the RC in question. Finally, in questions 1-4 and 9, the panellists were expected to classify their written feedback into one of the provided levels (the levels included respective descriptions, 'criteria'). Some panels used decimals in marks. The descriptive level was interpreted according to the integers and not rounding up the decimals by the editors.

Description of criteria levels

Question 1 – FOCUS AND QUALITY OF THE RC'S RESEARCH

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)

Outstandingly strong research, also from international perspective. Attracts great international interest with a wide impact, including publications in leading journals and/or monographs published by leading international publishing houses. The research has world leading qualities. The research focus, key research questions scientific significance, societal impact and innovativeness are of outstanding quality.

In cases where the research is of a national character and, in the judgement of the evaluators, should remain so, the concepts of "international attention" or "international impact" etc. in the grading criteria above may be replaced by "international comparability".

Operations and procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality.

Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)

Research of excellent quality. Typically published with great impact, also internationally. Without doubt, the research has a leading position in its field in Finland.

Operations and procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality.

Very good quality of procedures and results (3)

The research is of such very good quality that it attracts wide national and international attention.

Operations and procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

Good quality of procedures and results (2)

Good research attracting mainly national attention but possessing international potential, extraordinarily high relevance may motivate good research.

Operations and procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)

In some cases the research is insufficient and reports do not gain wide circulation or do not have national or international attention. Research activities should be revised.

Operations and procedures are of sufficient quality, shared occasionally in the community. The improvement of research and other efforts are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

Question 2 – DOCTORAL TRAINING

Question 3 – SOCIETAL IMPACT

Question 4 – COLLABORATION

Classification: Criteria (level of procedures and results)

Outstanding quality of procedures and results (5)

Procedures are of outstanding quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of outstanding quality. The procedures and results are regularly evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

Excellent quality of procedures and results (4)

Procedures are of excellent quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of excellent quality. The procedures and outcomes are evaluated and the feedback has an effect on the planning.

Very good quality of procedures and results (3)

Procedures are of very good quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and

management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of very good quality.

Good quality of procedures and results (2)

Procedures are of good quality, shared occasionally in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are documented and operations and practices are to large extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of good quality.

Sufficient quality of procedures and results (1)

Procedures are of sufficient quality, transparent and shared in the community. The practices and quality of doctoral training/societal impact/international and national collaboration/leadership and management are occasionally documented and operations and practices are to some extent in alignment with the documentation. The ambition to develop the community together is of sufficient quality.

Question 9 – CATEGORY

Participation category – fitness for the category chosen

The choice and justification for the chosen category below should be reflected in the RC's responses to the evaluation questions 1–8.

1. *The research of the participating community represents the international cutting edge in its field.*
2. *The research of the participating community is of high quality, but the community in its present composition has yet to achieve strong international recognition or a clear break-through.*
3. *The research of the participating community is distinct from mainstream research, and the special features of the research tradition in the field must be considered in the evaluation.* The research is of high quality and has great significance and impact in its field. However, the generally used research evaluation methods do not necessarily shed sufficient light on the merits of the research.
4. *The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening.* A new opening can be an innovative combination of research fields, or it can be proven to have a special social, national or international demand or other significance. Even if the researcher community in its present composition has yet to obtain proof of international success, its members can produce convincing evidence of the high level of their previous research.
5. *The research of the participating community has a highly significant societal impact.* The participating researcher community is able to justify the high social significance of its research. The research may relate to national legislation, media visibility or participation in social debate, or other activities promoting social development and human welfare. In addition to having societal impact, the research must be of a high standard.

An example of outstanding fitness for category choice (5) ⁵

The RC's representation and argumentation for the chosen category were convincing. The RC recognized its real capacity and apparent outcomes in a wider context to the research communities. The specific character of the RC was well-recognized and well stated in the responses. The RC fitted optimally for the category.

- Outstanding (5)
- Excellent (4)
- Very good (3)
- Good (2)
- Sufficient (1)

The above-mentioned definition of outstanding was only an example in order to assist the panellists in the positioning of the classification. There was no exact definition for the category fitness.

⁵ The panels discussed the category fitness and made the final conclusions of the interpretation of it.

1.8 Timetable of the evaluation

The main timetable of the evaluation:

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 1. Registration | November 2010 |
| 2. Submission of self-evaluation materials | January–February 2011 |
| 3. External peer review | May–September 2011 |
| 4. Published reports | March–April 2012 |
| - University level public report | |
| - RC specific reports | |

The entire evaluation was implemented during the university's strategy period 2010–2012. The preliminary results were available for the planning of the following strategy period in late autumn 2011. The evaluation reports will be published in March/April 2012. More detailed time schedule is published in the University report.

1.9 Evaluation feedback – consensus of the entire panel

The panellists evaluated all the RC-specific material before the meetings in Helsinki and mailed the draft reports to the evaluation office. The latest interim versions were on-line available to all the panellists on the Wiki-sites. In September 2011, in Helsinki the panels discussed the material, revised the first draft reports and decided the final numeric evaluation. After the meetings in Helsinki, the panels continued working and finalised the reports before the end of November 2011. The final RC-specific reports are the consensus of the entire panel.

The evaluation reports were written by the panels independently. During the editing process, the evaluation office requested some clarifications from the panels when necessary. The tone and style in the reports were not harmonized in the editing process. All the reports follow the original texts written by the panels as far as it was possible.

The original evaluation material of the RCs, provided for the panellists is attached at the end of the report. It is essential to notice that the exported lists of publications and other scientific activities depend how the data was stored in the TUHAT-RIS by the RCs.

2 Evaluation feedback

2.1 Focus and quality of the RC's research

- *Description of*
 - *the RC's research focus*
 - *the quality of the RC's research (incl. key research questions and results)*
 - *the scientific significance of the RC's research in the research field(s)*
- *Identification of the ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC's research*

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness

The establishment of an RC focused on Cultural capital and social stratification is an innovative opening in Finland, clearly inspired by the cultural sociology of the late Pierre Bourdieu. It is a small group, of eight members, among whom three doctoral candidates. It was formed in 2005, but as a start-up it takes time for its quality to show. For 2005-9 most of its international publications were written by professor Gronow, then at Uppsala. Most of the evaluation period has been a period of data collection for CulCap.

But the research is certainly promising, based on a national survey, on focus groups, and depth interviews, as can be glimpsed from a brief internationally comparative preliminary provided in the report. It is also a strength that systematic efforts are made to make the findings comparable to those of other countries.

While the RC is obviously leading in its field in Finland, it is too early to say much about its quality.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)

2.2 Practises and quality of doctoral training

- *Organising of the doctoral training in the RC. Description of the RC's principles for:*
 - *recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates*
 - *supervision of doctoral candidates*
 - *collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes*
 - *good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training*
 - *assuring of good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates*
- *Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.*
- *Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC's other scientific activities/supervision of doctoral dissertations*

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

The RC is part of the doctoral program of the Department of Social Research, wherein it runs a monthly seminar of its own. Its two first doctoral candidates are to submit their theses in 2011. At the time of the RC report it had 3 PhD students.

Numeric evaluation: 3 (Very good)

2.3 The societal impact of research and doctoral training

- *Description on how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).*
- *Identification of the ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC's research and doctoral training.*

- *Additional material: TUHAT compilation of the RC's other scientific activities.*

ASPECTS: Societal impact, national and international collaboration, innovativeness

Given the general topicality of the research focus, the report on societal impact is rather thin, and the media presence not very pronounced.

Numeric evaluation: 2 (Good)

2.4 International and national (incl. intersectoral) research collaboration and researcher mobility

- *Description of*
 - *the RC's research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities*
 - *how the RC has promoted researcher mobility*
- *Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.*

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, national and international collaboration

CulCap has a close collaboration with similar research groups in Manchester and in Aalborg, with a view to making findings comparable, which holds good promise for the future. The doctoral students have been integrated into the international collaboration.

Numeric evaluation: 4 (Excellent)

2.5 Operational conditions

- *Description of the operational conditions in the RC's research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).*
- *Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.*

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

Conditions seem to be excellent, given the generosity of the Academy of Finland and the environment of the Department of Social Research.

2.6 Leadership and management in the researcher community

- *Description of*
 - *the execution and processes of leadership in the RC*
 - *how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC*
 - *how the leadership- and management-related processes support*
 - *high quality research*
 - *collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC*
 - *the RC's research focus*
 - *strengthening of the RC's know-how*
- *Identification of the RC's strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes*

ASPECTS: Processes and good practices related to leadership and management

The small group has made effective leadership, by the RC director, easy, and easily combinable with collegiality among the investigators.

2.7 External competitive funding of the RC

- *The RCs were asked to provide information of such external competitive funding, where:*
 - *the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010, and*
 - *the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki*
- *On the e-form the RCs were asked to provide:*
 - 1) *The relevant funding source(s) from a given list (Academy of Finland/Research Council, TEKES/The Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation, EU, ERC, foundations, other national funding organisations, other international funding organizations), and*
 - 2) *The total sum of funding which the organisation in question had decided to allocate to the RCs members during 1.1.2005–31.12.2010.*

Competitive funding reported in the text is also to be considered when evaluating this point.

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal impact, innovativeness and future significance

For its size the RC has acquired substantial, and sufficient, national funding.

2.8 The RC's strategic action plan for 2011–2013

- *RC's description of their future perspectives in relation to research and doctoral training.*

ASPECTS: Scientific quality, scientific significance, societal Impact, processes and good practices related to leadership and management, national and international collaboration, innovativeness, future significance

The strategic plan focuses on publishing a Finnish book in 2012 on Cultural Capital in Finland. While this is certainly an apt goal, a plan of a book to an international scholarly audience too is to be recommended.

2.9 Evaluation of the category of the RC in the context of entity of the evaluation material (1-8)

The RC's fitness to the chosen participation category.

Category 4. The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening.

This is a very promising national innovative opening, with an excellent fit in category 4. To what extent it will also be internationally innovative will only be assessable in the future.

Numeric evaluation: 5 (Outstanding)

2.10 Short description of how the RC members contributed the compilation of the stage 2 material

Previously external affiliates have been included in the RC material.

2.11 How the UH's focus areas are presented in the RC's research

The research of CulCap pertains both to Language and Culture, and to Social Justice.

2.12 RC-specific main recommendations

Attention should be paid to innovation of international cultural sociology.

2.13 RC-specific conclusions

This RC is an interesting national innovation, with a very clear focus and a well thought out research programme. It testifies to the viability of small RCs. In the medium term it should raise its ambitions to international innovativeness.

3 Appendices

- A. Original evaluation material
 - a. Registration material – Stage 1
 - b. Answers to evaluation questions – Stage 2
 - c. List of publications
 - d. List of other scientific activities
- B. Bibliometric analyses
 - a. Analysis provided by CWTS/University of Leiden
 - b. Analysis provided by Helsinki University Library (66 RCs)



International evaluation of research and doctoral training
at the University of Helsinki 2005-2010

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW

NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:

Cultural Capital and Social Stratification (CulCap)

LEADER OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:

Professor Keijo Rahkonen, Department of Social Research

RC-SPECIFIC MATERIAL FOR THE PEER REVIEW:

- Material submitted by the RC at stages 1 and 2 of the evaluation
 - STAGE 1 material: RC's registration form (incl. list of RC participants in an excel table)
 - STAGE 2 material: RC's answers to evaluation questions
- TUHAT compilations of the RC members' publications 1.1.2005-31.12.2010
- TUHAT compilations of the RC members' other scientific activities 1.1.2005-31.12.2010
- UH Library analysis of publications data 1.1.2005-31.12.2010 – results of UH Library analysis will be available by the end of June 2011

NB! Since Web of Science(WoS)-based bibliometrics does not provide representative results for most RCs representing humanities, social sciences and computer sciences, the publications of these RCs will be analyzed by the UH Library (results available by the end of June, 2011)



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

1 RESPONSIBLE PERSON

Name: Rahkonen, Keijo

E-mail:

Phone: 09-191 24572

Affiliation: Department of Social Research

Street address: Snellmaninkatu 10

2 DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTICIPATING RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (RC)

Name of the participating RC (max. 30 characters): Cultural Capital and Social Stratification

Acronym for the participating RC (max. 10 characters): CulCap

Description of the operational basis in 2005-2010 (eg. research collaboration, joint doctoral training activities) on which the RC was formed (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC consists of teachers and researchers in the Department of Social Research who have conducted research – in close collaboration with each other over the years – on the questions of social differentiation and status hierarchies in present day Finland in a wider European comparative and historical perspective. The aim of the RC is to strengthen this important field of research at our University. The studies of the research group have analyzed the role of consumption, highbrow culture and art in the making of such cultural distinctions, which generate life styles and tend to keep up class distinctions in society. One of the main research questions has been the character and importance of hierarchies of taste in the formation of socially homologous classes in the late modern societies. The members of the RC have both theoretical and empirical interests. It has produced results which have revealed interesting features which seem to be quite unique to the Finnish society and which is shares with other developed Western European societies. The big ongoing research project Cultural capital and social differentiation since 2005, which both the University of Helsinki and the Academy of Finland have financed (360.000 euros), forms the core of the group. These studies inspired by the theoretical and empirical contributions of Pierre Bourdieu, have a long history at the Department of the Social Research at Helsinki. The RC has organized its own doctoral training and postgraduate seminars. These studies have generated both doctoral dissertations and numerous scientific publications. The RC has extensive cooperation with researchers in other European countries, in particular in Denmark, Norway, UK and France. The RC has in fact several other affiliated principal investigators – Alan Warde (Jane and Aatos Erkko Visiting Research Professor in Studies of Contemporary Society, Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies; Manchester University), Pekka Sulkunen (Professor of Sociology) and J.P. Roos (Professor of Social Policy) among others), but due to the restrictions in the application in this category we are not allowed to include them formally in our application.



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

3 SCIENTIFIC FIELDS OF THE RC

Main scientific field of the RC's research: social sciences

RC's scientific subfield 1: Sociology

RC's scientific subfield 2: --Select--

RC's scientific subfield 3: --Select--

RC's scientific subfield 4: --Select--

Other, if not in the list:

4 RC'S PARTICIPATION CATEGORY

Participation category: 4. Research of the participating community represents an innovative opening

Justification for the selected participation category (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): Cultural change is an important political and social issue. The sociology of culture is one of the major domains of theoretical development in sociology in the 21st century. Our RC is the leading group in Finland and an innovative project illuminating class differentiation in the current historical conjuncture. The RC is a relatively young research group. It is for the first time in Finland that these issues are studied empirically in systematic manner. There is a longer tradition of studying these or similar research questions in the Department of Social Research, but the RC started its activities and in more organized forms first in 2005. It has already produced important results both to the Finnish and international research community. The project is a model of multi-method sociological analysis – at the forefront of methodological developments including the diffusion of MCA and mixed methods. This has implications for the doctoral training as well as for the Finnish sociology in general. It has actively promoted doctoral studies. The first doctoral dissertations will be defended in 2011. It has established a new research field in close collaboration with the leading researchers in Europe, eg. Network for the Studies of Cultural Distinctions and Social Differentiation (SCUD). There is a growing interest in several European countries in the research of our RC which has resulted a number of visiting research fellows. One can therefore claim that this RC is a highly innovative opening, which can already show definite merits. By combining the questions of social differentiation with those of cultural distinctions it has introduced a new approach to the social sciences in Finland. Its research is already quite well known and recognized internationally. It has established itself quite recently and will show its real strength in the near future by additional international publications and scientific achievements. Additional support would help to guarantee that the field of research, the theoretical approach and research methods it represents become firmly established at the University of Helsinki and guarantee its future visibility internationally.

5 DESCRIPTION OF THE RC'S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Public description of the RC's research and doctoral training (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC studies social differentiation and cultural distinctions in the formation of status hierarchies in Finland in a comparative perspective. One of the main questions has been the character and importance of cultural consumption, and in particular the consumption of various cultural products, both highbrow and popular



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

culture, in the making of such distinctions which are relevant to the formation of social classes and status groups. The group has produced reliable and internationally comparable information about cultural capital, cultural practices and tastes. It has collected extensive empirical data relying both on quantitative and qualitative research methods. The main purpose of the research is to find out how cultural resources are distributed and what kinds of social differentiation currently exist, as well as to analyze the structuring factors that shape these differences in Finland. The research is carried out in close collaboration with other European research groups, the British, Danish and Norwegian in particular, which enables interesting international comparisons. The RC can make a contribution both the theoretical development of the field and produce empirical results which are relevant not only to the Finnish case but have wider implications concerning social differentiation and hierarchical nature of modern Western societies. The RC utilizes both quantitative and qualitative data. Especially important was the collection of a new nationally representative survey data, conducted by Statistics Finland in 2007. The qualitative part of the data set is comprised of focus group interviews as well as a selection of follow-up in-depth interviews with survey respondents. Our data is comparable with other countries and there are currently plans for systematic international comparisons with possibilities for the European Research Council funding. These extensive data sets will be used studying several actual questions of social and cultural differentiation. The research will have not only general social scientific importance but its results will also be relevant for social and cultural policies – and more generally in connection with social inequality.

Significance of the RC's research and doctoral training for the University of Helsinki (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC has introduced a new field of research at the University of Helsinki which has both high social relevance and which, by participating actively in the international research community, makes an important contribution to the development of social science in its field. The RC has developed a number of new international networks with many leading scholars in Europe. The research community and the research group in particular has organized teaching in the Department of Social Research both on the graduate and postgraduate level, e.g. workshops on research method and a research seminar for postgraduate students. Moreover, it has also organized seminars with invited visiting colleagues from abroad for a wider audience at the University. RC has contributed remarkably to the strengthening of its own research field by its active doctoral training. One doctoral student has submitted her manuscript for pre-examination and will defend her thesis in Winter 2011; another is about to submit her thesis and will defend it in Spring 2011. One post-doc researcher of the group has succeeded in raising research funds from the Academy of Finland, which enables us to carry on the research project for its part.

Keywords: Cultural capital, distinction, social stratification

6 QUALITY OF RC'S RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING

Justified estimate of the quality of the RC's research and doctoral training at national and international level during 2005-2010 (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The RC has introduced a new field of research in Finland which has both high social relevance and which, by participating actively in the international research community, makes an important contribution to the development of social science in its field. The RC has developed a number of new international networks with many leading scholars in Europe. The quality of the research is indicated by the number of single and co-authored articles published in established international and in Finnish journals. The RC has contributed greatly to the strengthening of its



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 1 MATERIAL (registration form)

own research field by its active doctoral training in international co-operation with the European Network for the Studies of Cultural Distinctions and Social Differentiation (SCUD). SCUD is a funded network of scholars containing some of the most eminent sociologists of culture and stratification in Europe, a locus for discussion of central theoretical and empirical issues. First of our doctoral students are now ready to submit their theses for defence.

Comments on how the RC's scientific productivity and doctoral training should be evaluated (MAX. 2200 characters with spaces): The articles published in refereed scientific journals are of course an indicator of quality. Because of the quality and the topic of our study we have been able to publish in the leading international journals in the field, like 'Poetics: Journal of Empirical Research on Culture, Media and the Arts'. Our work has been well received by international peers at conferences and seminars. Not only their quantity but also quality and scientific importance as well as their wider societal relevance should count. Our strategy is to publish both internationally and domestically. As for the results of our doctoral training, it is a bit too early to assess them, as the first doctoral theses are to be defended in the year 2011. Our publishing strategy also includes a comprehensive book, 'Cultural Capital in Finland', summarizing our results in Finnish (to be published in 2012)

LIST OF RC MEMBERS

NAME OF THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY:			CulCap		
RC-LEADER			K. Rahkonen		
CATEGORY			4		
	Last name	First name	PI-status (TUHAT, 29.11.2010)	Title of research and teaching personnel	Affiliation
1	Rahkonen	Keijo	x	University Lecturer	Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research
2	Gronow	Jukka	x	Professor	Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research
3	Purhonen	Semi	x	Postdoctoral researcher	Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research
4	Kahma	Nina		Doctoral Candidate	Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research
5	Heikkilä	Riie		Doctoral Candidate	Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research
6	Laihiala	Tuomo		Doctoral Candidate	Faculty of Social Sciences, Department of Social Research
7	Warde	Alan		Professor	Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies
8	Gurova	Olga	x	Research Fellow	Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Name of the RC's responsible person: Rahkonen, Keijo

E-mail of the RC's responsible person:

Name and acronym of the participating RC: Cultural Capital and Social Stratification, CulCap

The RC's research represents the following key focus area of UH: -- Select --

Comments for selecting/not selecting the key focus area: Our RC's research overlaps at least partially a couple of the key focus areas of UH: Language and culture, Social justice and Globalisation and social change.

1 FOCUS AND QUALITY OF RC'S RESEARCH (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- **Description of the RC's research focus, the quality of the RC's research (incl. key research questions and results) and the scientific significance of the RC's research for the research field(s).**

Our RC is theoretically and methodically quite compact. It shares a relatively well-defined research field which generates questions that can be empirically tested at the same time by researchers and research groups in different countries. It is the leading, innovative RC in Finland studying systematically and empirically class differentiation and cultural distinctions in Finland. Its major asset is that it studies social and cultural hierarchies, such as status hierarchies, in an international comparative setting, in close collaboration with several other European research groups organized in an European research network which all are following in their research in the footsteps of Pierre Bourdieu and his famous work, *Distinction* thus sharing a common conceptual and theoretical platform. One of our main research questions has been the character and importance of cultural consumption, particularly the consumption of various cultural products, both high brow and low brow or popular culture, in the making of such distinctions which are relevant to the preservation and formation of social classes and status groups. Even though these questions have been addressed in Finland previously by social scientists, no one has analyzed them as extensively and systematically as our RC. We study the distribution of economic, cultural and social capital in Finland and its effects on cultural tastes and cultural practices. Particularly, four major research questions engage our project and unite also the work of the different members of the RC:

- 1) Are there clear class distinctions in Finland and Europe (more precisely in the European countries that are part of the research network; see later), which would come into appearance as relatively distinctive cultural tastes and life styles?
- 2) What is the destiny of traditional highbrow culture ("fine culture") as a sign of high social and cultural status in our societies? Is it losing its status due to, among others, the democratization of learning and education?
- 3) Is it possible to identify bigger social groups, such as lower social classes or uneducated people in our societies, which would be more or less excluded from what might be called "common or main stream culture"?
- 4) What other kinds of important cultural distinctions can be identified in our societies? More particularly we have studied the importance of gender and native language in Finland (Swedish speaking minority in Finland).



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

The main results and findings can be summarized respectively as follows:

- 1) Even though quite clear cultural distinctions exist between social classes, measured both by their degree of cultural and economic capital, Finland seems to be culturally rather homogeneous in comparison to many European societies: One could even, at least preliminary and comparatively, claim that Finland is a 'taste democracy'.
- 2) On the other hand, just like in the UK, there seems to be a basic dividing line between those, members of the upper class and large middle class, and the uneducated and relatively poor – and not very extensive – social groups. Whereas the former engaged widely in culture and its different forms, the latter are to a great extent excluded and engage only in very few cultural activities, like watching TV.
- 3) The American cultural sociologist, DiMaggio has proposed the so-called meltdown hypothesis according to which the highbrow culture loses its meaning as a sign or symbol of high social standing. It is difficult to take a definite stance to this question in lack of systematic historical data but there are some indicators which point to this direction even in Finland, particularly the big number of cultural omnivores, or cultural all-eaters, as well as their predominance among the older educated social groups.
- 4) Gender seems to be quite an important factor in Finland, even more so than in many other European or North American countries. Educated middle aged or elderly women are in Finland the 'real' consumers of highbrow culture in most of its forms, and they have also developed a taste for the cultural products in various fields, most prominently in literature. The Swedish speaking minority which is internationally a rather peculiar minority group often presented as almost exemplary because its social and economic constitution does not differ remarkably from the Finnish speaking majority does not distinguish itself culturally from the majority either – except in the rather trivial sense that it likes and is more familiar with cultural products which are accessible in its own language, Swedish.

The RC has not only contributed to the production of highly relevant empirical results, which are relevant not only in Finland but have wider implications concerning modern developed Western societies. It has also made theoretical contributions to the development of its research field, for instance by problematizing and developing the relation of social class in the Bourdieusian sense to other social determinants as well as by analyzing conceptually the relation between taste, knowledge and behaviour in the constitution of life styles.

The research of cultural distinctions and social differentiation does not have only general scientific relevance but is relevant also for public discussion and social and cultural politics. This is particularly true of the social problems of inequality and exclusion.

- **Ways to strengthen the focus and improve the quality of the RC's research.**

What we still lack are such extensive data sets which would allow us to compare historically our results with previous times, say 1950s or 1960s, in order to make more precise conclusions about the direction of cultural and social change. The collecting of new extensive empirical data sets is by no means inexpensive but demands rather big financial resources. Therefore it is rather difficult for the research community to direct and organize collecting of new data in several countries at the same time. It would however be extremely useful for the strengthening of this RC. In social science there is much talk about social and cultural change but it is mostly based on rather weak evidence. One of the next strategic steps in our research field will without doubt be an organized, joint effort to get European research funding for a bigger research group consisting of researchers from several European countries.

2 PRACTISES AND QUALITY OF DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 8800 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

- How is doctoral training organised in the RC? Description of the RC's principles for recruitment and selection of doctoral candidates, supervision of doctoral candidates, collaboration with faculties, departments/institutes, and potential graduate schools/doctoral programmes, good practises and quality assurance in doctoral training, and assuring good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates/fresh doctorates.

Our RC has actively promoted doctoral studies. The doctoral students have been recruited through an open application process, which is very competitive.

RC has contributed remarkably to the strengthening of its own research field by its active doctoral training. One doctoral student has submitted her manuscript for pre-examination and will defend her thesis in Spring 2011; another is just about to submit her thesis and will defend it later in 2011.

The research community and the research group in particular has organized teaching in the Department of Social Research both on the graduate and postgraduate level, e.g. workshops on research method and a research seminar for postgraduate students.

Our doctoral students have participated in the doctoral programs of our Department, but the RC has also had regular monthly meetings where our doctoral students have presented their papers. The senior members of the RC have given personal supervision to the doctoral students. We have also been able to offer a limited amount of travel bursaries for our students to present their papers in national and international conferences. The close research collaboration with the leading researchers in Europe, e.g. the Network for the Studies of Cultural Distinctions and Social Differentiation (SCUD), has enabled our doctoral students to take in part in the seminars organized by the SCUD network.

Thus far the doctoral candidates have been very successful in getting stipends, and our fresh doctorates seem to have quite good career perspectives. One post-doc researcher of the group has succeeded in raising research funds for the next years 2010-2012 from the Academy of Finland, which enables us to carry on the research project for its part.

- RC's strengths and challenges related to the practises and quality of doctoral training, and the actions planned for their development.

As for the RC's strengths, it has contributed greatly to the strengthening of its own research field by its active doctoral training in international co-operation with the European Network for the Studies of Cultural Distinctions and Social Differentiation (SCUD). Our participation in international seminars and publishing in established international and Finnish journals has guaranteed the quality of doctoral training.

One of the challenges is to recruit more talented doctoral students to our RC and find funding for their studies. Another great challenge will be how to assure good career perspectives for the doctoral candidates and fresh doctorates in the near future

3 SOCIETAL IMPACT OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of how the RC interacts with and contributes to the society (collaboration with public, private and/or 3rd sector).

In the field of social sciences, there is almost always a clear societal impact of the RC's research and doctoral training. Members of our RC actively participate in public discussions in the media (interviews,



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

etc.) as invited experts, and also, for instance in the Science Days 2011 organized by the Federation of Finnish Learned Societies.

The RC makes a contribution both the theoretical development of the field and produce comparative empirical results which are relevant not only to the Finnish case but have wider implications to the general conclusions and discussions concerning the social differentiation and hierarchical nature of modern Western societies.

The research of the RC has not only general social scientific importance but its results will also be relevant for social and cultural policies – and more generally in connection with social inequality.

- Ways to strengthen the societal impact of the RC's research and doctoral training.

RC has contributed greatly to the strengthening of its own research field by its active doctoral training in international co-operation with the European Network for the Studies of Cultural Distinctions and Social Differentiation (SCUD). First two of our doctoral students are now ready to submit their theses for defence. There is no doubt that the results of the dissertations as well other research results of the RC will arouse public discussion and also have an impact on public policies in Finland. Our forthcoming book on cultural capital in Finland (an international comparison) will most likely get public attention in media.

4 INTERNATIONAL AND NATIONAL (INCL. INTERSECTORAL) RESEARCH COLLABORATION AND RESEARCHER MOBILITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the RC's research collaborations and joint doctoral training activities and how the RC has promoted researcher mobility.

The RC has from the very beginning had extensive collaboration with researchers and research groups in several European, in particular UK, France, Denmark and Norway, and other countries, particularly Israel. The research group has been a member of the European Network for the Studies of Cultural Distinctions and Social Differentiation, SCUD (founded in 2008) which has organized regular seminars and workshops the aim of which has been to exchange new research results, experiences and coordinate common endeavours. Our active participation in the research group on the Sociology of Consumption in the European Sociological Association has also been very useful in this respect.

All the doctoral students in our RC have taken also active part in this international cooperation and had the great benefit of receiving comments and advice to their work from the leading European scholars in their field. They have thus been integrated in the international research community from the very beginning of their careers.

Our RC has attracted one visiting research fellow, Chiara Rabbiosi, PhD, from Università di Milano-Bicocca, who visited the University of Helsinki for one academic year 2009-2010. In Finland we have collaborated closely with Ms. Mirja Liikkanen, Project Manager of Statistics Finland, who is responsible for the collection and analysis of official cultural statistics in Finland, as well as with Academy Professor Pertti Alasuutari (University of Tampere) who conducted a previous research on similar themes in Finland in 1997. Access to his data has allowed us to make, at least partially, historical comparisons.

We would like to mention in particular, that professor Alan Warde (Manchester University), one of the leading figures in the British research group, who spends the academic years 2010-2011 and 2012-2013 at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies, University of Helsinki. He is an associated member of our RC and can thus participate closely in our work.



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

- RC's strengths and challenges related to research collaboration and researcher mobility, and the actions planned for their development.

Two European research groups have played a particularly important role to our RC. The cooperation with them has been very extensive and intensive all the time. These are the British Research Group on Cultural Distinction and Social Differentiation (Manchester University and Open University) and the Danish similar research group at the University of Aalborg). We have in many ways all collected our data sets and used the same methods in analyzing them in close collaboration with these two groups in order to make them as comparable as possible. This close collaboration – including researcher mobility – will continue in the future. We have also new plans of making it even more intensive, for instance, introducing new innovative research designs which aim at answering the question how qualitative data can be used more strictly and systematically to comparative purposes.

5 OPERATIONAL CONDITIONS (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the operational conditions in the RC's research environment (e.g. research infrastructure, balance between research and teaching duties).

The research funding, above all, from the Research Council for Culture and Society at the Academy of Finland has enabled us quite good operational conditions. Especially important was the rather expensive collection of a new nationally representative survey data, conducted by Statistics Finland (Central Statistical Office of Finland) in the last part of the year 2007 as well as the qualitative part of the data set comprised of over 50 focus group interviews and a selection of 25 follow-up in-depth interviews with survey respondents. In addition, our doctoral students have succeeded well in receiving stipends for their studies.

The Department of Social Research has offered for our researchers and doctoral students office space, etc. Our international research networks have from the very beginning been of great help for the RC. As far as the travelling money is concerned, our research budget has also been rather generous.

As far as teaching is concerned, our doctoral students have had rather moderate duties. The director of the RC – Keijo Rahkonen – has acted for the whole period of 2005-2010 as the Head of the Department of Social Research at the University of Helsinki with various administrative duties that has to certain degree affected his active participation in research and reporting, whereas one senior member of the RC, Prof. Jukka Gronow has had his regular teaching duties at the University of Uppsala (now at the University of Helsinki).

- RC's strengths and challenges related to operational conditions, and the actions planned for their development.

The strength of our RC's operational conditions has been quite a good research funding, but as the funding has now more or less ended, the biggest challenge is finding new resources for further analysis and publishing, although we can continue to a certain extent to work also on the existing basis for the next couple of years.



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

6 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT IN THE RESEARCHER COMMUNITY (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the execution and processes of leadership in the RC, how the management-related responsibilities and roles are distributed in the RC and how the leadership- and management-related processes support high quality research, collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC, the RC's research focus and strengthening of the RC's know-how.

The director of the RC – Keijo Rahkonen – has been in charge of the leadership and management in the researcher community, but a management team consisting of the senior researchers, i.e. principal investigators, has actively supported his job. We have agreed on a clear division of labour between principal investigators and other researchers (including doctoral students) in conducting the research processes (for instance data analysis, doing interviews, writing particular research reports and articles, etc.).

The most important forum for collaboration between principal investigators and other researchers in the RC has been the regular monthly meetings. Meetings with the foreign partners have been organized in association with the international seminars and business meetings several times a year. Furthermore, our RC has annually retreated to a conference venue for a couple days to discuss more principal and actual research problems and to make plans for the future.

The activities of the RC have essentially been based on the collegial form of cooperation in which also our doctoral students have participated.

- RC's strengths and challenges related to leadership and management, and the actions planned for developing the processes.

The above model of leadership has been quite functional and satisfactory in general. If, as we hope, our RC and its international cooperation will continue to grow, it becomes necessary to employ more research assistants and a research secretary.

7 EXTERNAL COMPETITIVE FUNDING OF THE RC

- Listing of the RCs external competitive funding, where:
 - the funding decisions have been made during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and
 - the administrator of the funding is/has been the University of Helsinki
- Academy of Finland (AF) - total amount of funding (in euros) AF has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: 320020
- Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation (TEKES) - total amount of funding (in euros) TEKES has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: -
- European Union (EU) - total amount of funding (in euros) EU has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: -
- European Research Council (ERC) - total amount of funding (in euros) ERC has decided to allocate to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010: -



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

- International and national foundations – names of international and national foundations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
 - names of the foundations: University of Helsinki Research Funds; Finnish Cultural Foundation; Kone Foundation; Rector of the University of Helsinki, University's own research allocations; Society of Swedish Literature in Finland; Finnish Concordia Fund; Otto A. Malm Fund
 - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned foundations: 275900
- Other international funding - names of other international funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
 - names of the funding organizations: -
 - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations:
- Other national funding (incl. EVO funding and Ministry of Education and Culture funded doctoral programme positions) - names of other national funding organizations which have decided to allocate funding to the RC members during 1.1.2005-31.12.2010, and the amount of their funding (in euros).
 - names of the funding organizations: SOVAKO, the Finnish Doctoral Program in Social Sciences
 - total amount of funding (in euros) from the above-mentioned funding organizations: 24375

8 RC'S STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN FOR 2011–2013 (MAX. 4400 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES)

- Description of the RC's future perspectives in respect to research and doctoral training.

One of our nearest and most concrete goals is to finish writing the manuscript of the book 'Cultural Capital in Finland: Distinctions and Social Differentiation in Contemporary Finland' to be published in Finnish in 2012. This book is a general presentation of the main questions and findings of our RC (at the present stage of our research) and will be written jointly by most of the members of the RC.

We shall continue publishing scientific articles on various specific topics in esteemed international scientific journals. In 2011 at least four articles are forthcoming, and in 2012 another three or four.

The European SCUD Research Network will continue organizing regular workshops and seminars in 2011-2013.

The planning of applying European funding for a larger international cluster of research groups from several European countries (with the members of the SCUD network) will continue actively in 2011 and will most likely be realized in the following year, 2012. If we succeed in raising European money, it will allow us both to make even better and more extensive international comparisons as well as at least to start analyzing historical chance with more reliable empirical data.

We shall apply for extra funding for our research from the Academy of Finland in 2011. A particularly important step is to secure the future research by guaranteeing with all available means that the two doctoral students who will defend their theses later this year can continue their research activities in a post-doctoral position.

During 2011 we shall recruit at least two new doctoral students to the research group.

9 SHORT DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE RC MEMBERS HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO THE COMPILATION OF THE STAGE 2 MATERIALS (MAX. 1100 CHARACTERS WITH SPACES).



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC STAGE 2 MATERIAL

This report has been done collectively, and all members of the RC have contributed to the compilation of the stage 2 materials. We had first a research meeting with all the members of the RC discussing our research activities and future plans. After the collection of the relevant material, the final reporting has been done by the director of the RC, Keijo Rahkonen and Prof. Jukka Gronow in close cooperation with Prof. Alan Warde who is a member of our British partner research team from the University of Manchester, now the Jane and Aatos Erkkö Visiting Professor in Studies on Contemporary Society at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

1 Analysis of publications

- Associated person is one of Jukka Gronow ,
Tuomo Laihiala ,
Warde ,

Olga Gurova ,
Semi Purhonen ,

Riie Heikkilä ,
Keijo Rahkonen ,

Nina Kahma ,
Alan

Publication type	Publication year						Total Count 2005 - 2010
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
A1 Refereed journal article	1	5		4	3	3	16
A2 Review in scientific journal					1	1	2
A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)	3	4	4	8	4	1	24
B1 Unrefereed journal article	3	5	1	2	1	3	15
B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)						2	2
C1 Published scientific monograph				1			1
C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal		1	1	1	1	4	8
E1 Popular article, newspaper article		2	1	1			4
E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations	1						1



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

2 Listing of publications

A1 Refereed journal article

2005

Gronow, J 2005, 'O konventional'noi estetike v obshchestve moderna', **Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya**, no. 9, pp. 104-112.

2006

Gronow, J, Zhuravlev, S 2006, 'Vlast' mody i sovietskaya vlast': istoriya protivostoyaniya', **Istorik i khudozhnik**, no. 4, pp. 106-116.

Gronow, J, Zhuravlev, S 2006, 'Vlast' mody i sovietskaya vlast': istoriya protivostoyaniya', **Istorik i khudozhnik**, no. 1, pp. 133-147.

Gronow, J, Zhuravlev, S 2006, 'Vlast' mody i sovietskaya vlast': istoriya protivostoyaniya', **Istorik i khudozhnik**, no. 3, pp. 100-113.

Gronow, J, Zhuravlev, S 2006, 'Krasota pod kontrolem gosudarstva: Osobennosti i etapy stanovleniya sovetskoi mody', **The Soviet and post-Soviet review**, vol 32, pp. 1-92.

Gurova, O 2006, 'Ideology of Consumption in the Soviet Union: From Asceticism to Legitimizing of Consumer Goods', **The Anthropology of East Europe Review**, vol 24, no. 2, pp. 91-102.

2008

Heikkilä, R 2008, 'Bättre folk, bättre smak?: suomenruotsalainen itseidentifikaatio haastatteluaineiston valossa', **Yhteiskuntapolitiikka**, vol 73, no. 5, pp. 494-507.

Heikkilä, R, Kahma, N 2008, 'Defining legitimate taste in Finland: does mother tongue matter?', **Research on Finnish society**, vol 1, pp. 29-42.

Heikkilä, R 2008, 'Puhuva ryhmä: esimerkitapausta ryhmähaastattelun käytöstä sosiaalietieteellisessä tutkimusasetelmassa', **Sociologia**, vol 45, no. 4, pp. 292-305.

Rahkonen, K 2008, 'Bourdieu in Finland: an account of Bourdieu's influence on Finnish sociology', **Sociologica**, vol 2, no. 2, 15. s.

2009

Gurova, O 2009, 'The life span of things in Soviet society: notes on the sociology of underwear', **Russian Studies in History**, vol 48, no. 1, pp. 46-57.

Mihajlova, O, Gurova, O 2009, 'Potrebitel' v molle: mezdu svobodoy vybora i prostranstvennymi ograniceniami', **Zhurnal sociologii i social'noj antropologii**.

Purhonen, S, Gronow, J, Rahkonen, K 2009, 'Social differentiation of musical and literary taste patterns in Finland', **Research on Finnish society**, vol 2009, no. 2, pp. 39-49.

2010

Gronow, J, Zhuravlev, S 2010, 'The Soviet system of fashion: Fashion design at GUM, the State Department Store at Moscow', **Baltic worlds : scholarly journal : news magazine**, no. 2, pp. 27-33.

Kahma, N 2010, 'Keskiluokan valossa: Suomalaisten luokkasamastuminen empiirisessä tarkastelussa', **Sociologia**, vol 47., no. 2, pp. 81-96.

Purhonen, S, Gronow, J, Rahkonen, K 2010, 'Nordic democracy of taste? Cultural omnivorousness in musical and literary taste preferences in Finland', **Poetics**, vol 38, pp. 266-298.

A2 Review in scientific journal

2009

Purhonen, S 2009, 'Haljennut habitus: Bourdieun viimeiseksi jääneet omakohtaiset teokset englanninkielisinä käännöksinä', **Tiede & edistys**, vol 34, no. 3, pp. 241-255.

2010

Purhonen, S 2010, 'Kulttuuri, luokka ja distinktio brittiläisittäin', **Tiede & edistys**, vol 35, no. 4, pp. 317-326.

A3 Contribution to book/other compilations (refereed)



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

2005

Gronow, J **2005**, 'Champagne with Caviar: Soviet Kitsch', in C Korsmeyer (ed.), **The Taste Culture Reader. Experiencing Food and Drink.**, Berg Publishers, Oxford & New York, pp. 249-259.

Purhonen, S **2005**, 'Onko Attac sukupolviike? (ja mikä sukupolviike oikein on?)', in TTHSLJL (ed.), **Mitä on tehtävä?. nuorison kapinan teoriaa ja käytäntöä.**, Julkaisuja / Nuorisotutkimusverkosto & Nuorisotutkimusseura, vol. 52, Lohi-Kirjat, Helsinki, pp. 239-288.

Purhonen, S **2005**, 'Sukupolvikokemukset, sukupolvi-tietoisuus ja elitti: sukupolvien "ongelma" suurten ikäluokkien elämäntarinoissa', in AK (ed.), **Suuret ikäluokat**, Vastapaino, Tampere, pp. 222-269.

2006

Purhonen, S, Rahkonen, K, Roos, JP **2006**, 'Johdanto: Bourdieun sosiologian merkitys ja ominaislaatu', in SP&JPR (ed.), **Bourdieu ja minä. näkökulmia Pierre Bourdieun sosiologiaan.**, Vastapaino, Tampere, pp. 7-53.

Purhonen, S **2006**, 'Sukupolvet paperilla: kuinka käyttää Bourdieun sosiologiaa "generationalismin" haastamiseen?', in SP&JPR (ed.), **Bourdieu ja minä. näkökulmia Pierre Bourdieun sosiologiaan.**, Vastapaino, Tampere, pp. 177-226.

Rahkonen, K **2006**, 'Homo academicus: Bourdieun ajattelusta bourdieulaisesta perspektiivistä', in SP&JPR (ed.), **Bourdieu ja minä. näkökulmia Pierre Bourdieun sosiologiaan.**, Vastapaino, Tampere, pp. 103-130.

Rahkonen, K **2006**, 'Pierre Bourdieu - l'homo academicus: etude de la pensee de Bourdieu dans une perspective bourdieusienne', in FD&ES (ed.), **Intercultural communication and education. Finnish perspectives = Communication et education interculturelles : perspectives finlandaises.**, Transversales, vol. vol. 18, Peter Lang, Bern, pp. 207-226.

2007

Gronow, J **2007**, 'Taste, sociology of', in G Ritzer (ed.), **The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology**, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford, pp. 4930-4935.

Gronow, J, Zhuravlev, S **2007**, 'Neuvostomuodin synty: toisen maailmansodan jälkeisen kulutuskulttuurin erityispiirteitä Neuvostoliitossa', in K Kalleinen (ed.), **Venäjä ja Suomi, Aleksanteri-sarja**, vol. 1, Kikimora Publications, pp. 193-208.

Gronow, J **2007**, 'First class restaurants and luxury food stores: The emergence of the Soviet culture of consumption in the 1930s', in PJ Atkins, P Lummel, DJ Oddy (eds), **Food and the City in Europe since 1800**, Ashgate, Aldershot, pp. 143-154.

Gronow, J, Rahkonen, K, Sinnemäki, A **2007**, 'Johdanto: Arto Noro - sosiologian urheilukalastaja', in TJGKR&AS (ed.), **Small talkia sosiologiasta. kirjoituksia vuosilta 1995-2006.**, Tutkijaliitto, Helsinki, pp. 9-17.

2008

Hoikkala, T, Purhonen, S **2008**, 'Suurten ikäluokkien "tavallisten" jäsenten tyyppitarinat', in TSPTHJPR (ed.), **Kenen sukupolveen kuulut?. suurten ikäluokkien tarina.**, Gaudeamus, Helsinki, pp. 51-67.

Hoikkala, T, Roos, JP, Purhonen, S **2008**, 'Epäpoliittisen eliitin tyyppitarina', in TSPTHJPR (ed.), **Kenen sukupolveen kuulut?. suurten ikäluokkien tarina.**, Gaudeamus, Helsinki, pp. 89-107.

Purhonen, S **2008**, 'Suurten ikäluokkien sisäiset jaot yhteiskunnallisena sukupolvena', in TSPTHJPR (ed.), **Kenen sukupolveen kuulut?. suurten ikäluokkien tarina.**, Gaudeamus, Helsinki, pp. 197-230.

Purhonen, S **2008**, 'Johdanto: suuret ikäluokat sukupolvena?', in TSPTHJPR (ed.), **Kenen sukupolveen kuulut?. suurten ikäluokkien tarina.**, Gaudeamus, Helsinki, pp. 9-30.

Purhonen, S, Hoikkala, T **2008**, '60-lukulaisten eliitin tyyppitarina', in TSPTHJPR (ed.), **Kenen sukupolveen kuulut?. suurten ikäluokkien tarina.**, Gaudeamus, Helsinki, pp. 134-155.

Purhonen, S, Roos, JP, Hoikkala, T **2008**, 'Anti-60-lukulaisten tyyppitarina', in TSPTHJPR (ed.), **Kenen sukupolveen kuulut?. suurten ikäluokkien tarina.**, Gaudeamus, Helsinki, pp. 185-193.

Purhonen, S **2008**, 'Sukupolvikokemukset ja sukupolvi-tietoisuus suurten ikäluokkien elämäntarinoissa', in TSPTHJPR (ed.), **Kenen sukupolveen kuulut?. suurten ikäluokkien tarina.**, Gaudeamus, Helsinki, pp. 156-184.

Purhonen, S, Hoikkala, T, Roos, JP **2008**, 'Suuret ikäluokat ja elämän käännekohdat', in TSPTHJPR (ed.), **Kenen sukupolveen kuulut?. suurten ikäluokkien tarina.**, Gaudeamus, Helsinki, pp. 33-50.

2009

Gronow, J **2009**, 'Fads, fashions and 'real' innovations: Novelty and social change', in E Shove, F Trentmann, R Wilk (eds), **Time, Consumption and Everyday Life**, Berg Publishers, Oxford & New York, pp. 129-142.

Gronow, J, Southerton, D **2009**, 'Leisure and consumption in Europe', in S Immerwald, G Therborn (eds), **Handbook of European Societies. Social Transformations in the 21st Century.**, Springer, New York, pp. 335-384.



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

Gronow, J, Kjaernes, U, Holm, L, Mäkelä, J, Pipping Ekström, M 2009, 'The study of Nordic meals: lessons learnt', in HL Meiselman (ed.), **Meals in Science and Practice. Interdisciplinary Research and Business Applications.**, Woodhead Publishing Limited, London, pp. 69-91.

Gurova, O 2009, 'The Art of Dressing. Body, Gender and Discourse on Fashion in Soviet Russia in the 1950s and 60s', **The Fabric of Cultures. Fashion, Identity, Globalization**, Routledge, pp. 73-91.

2010

Gronow, J, Zhuravlev, S 2010, 'Soviet luxuries from champagne to private cars', in D Crowley, SE Reid (eds), **Pleasures in Socialism. Leisures and Luxury in the Bloc.**, Northwestern University Press, Evenston, Illinois, pp. 121-146.

B1 Unrefereed journal article

2005

Gronow, J 2005, 'En recension av Elin Lundin: Motstånd och kreativitet. Georg Herbert Meads bidrag till aktör-struktur debatten. Eslöv: Symposion 2004', **Sociologisk Forskning**, no. 3, pp. 89-92.

Gronow, J 2005, 'Roolileikki ja itsensä esittäminen: Modernin kaupungin puolijulkisuus', **Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu**, no. 4, pp. 51-54.

Purhonen, S 2005, 'Monipuolisesti suurista ikäluokista ja hieman 1960-luvustakin', **Sosiologia**, vol 42, no. 3, pp. 242-243.

2006

Gronow, J 2006, 'A book review', **Enterprise and Society**, no. 7, pp. 189-191.

Gronow, J 2006, 'Russia's new look, smell and taste', **Senses and Society**, no. 1, pp. 133-136.

Kahma, N 2006, 'Toisenlainen tulkinta distinktiosta: kysymys yksilöllisistä kulttuurivalinnoista ja makujen sisäisistä ristiriidoista', **Tiede & edistys**, vol 31, no. 3, pp. 240-248.

Rahkonen, K 2006, 'Akateemisen sosiaalipolitiikan tila ja tulevaisuus', **Janus : sosiaalipolitiikan ja sosiaalityön tutkimuksen aikakauslehti**, vol 14, no. 3, pp. 321-323.

Rahkonen, K 2006, 'Demokratiasta Amerikassa: puheenvuoroja Tocquevillestä: pääkirjoitus', **Tiede & edistys**, vol 31, no. 3, pp. 177-178.

2007

Purhonen, S 2007, 'Ahne sukupolvi, punavihreä sukupolvi ja sukupolvikäsitteen ongelmallisuus', **Nuorisotutkimus**, vol 25, no. 2, pp. 52-56.

2008

Gronow, J 2008, 'Bokomtale', **Sociologisk Forskning**, no. 16, pp. 303-306.

Rahkonen, K 2008, 'Sosiologia on kamppailulaji', **Tiede & edistys**, vol 33, no. 2, pp. 148-149.

2009

Purhonen, S 2009, 'Kulutustutkimuksen tilkkutäkki', **Sosiologia**, vol 46, no. 1, pp. 51-52.

2010

Purhonen, S 2010, 'Nykyuoruutta muistelemassa', **Nuorisotutkimus**, vol 28, no. 2, pp. 114-117.

Purhonen, S 2010, 'Vertailevan asenteen ihanuus ja kurjuus', **Sosiologia**, vol 47, no. 4, pp. 322-324.

Warde, A 2010, 'Harry Collins, Tacit and explicit Knowledge', **Sociological Review**, vol 58, no. 4, pp. 714-716.

B2 Contribution to book/other compilations (non-refereed)

2010

Warde, A, Savage, M, Silva, E 2010, 'Dis-identification and class identity', in E Silva, A Warde (eds), **Cultural Analysis and the Legacy of Bourdieu. settling accounts and developing alternatives.**, Routledge, London.

Warde, A 2010, 'Consumption and critique', in J Hall, L Grindstaff, L Ming-cheng (eds), **Handbook of Cultural Sociology**, Routledge, New York.

C1 Published scientific monograph



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF PUBLICATIONS DATA 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

2008

Gurova, O **2008**, *Советское нижнее белье: между идеологией и повседневностью*, **Novoye Literaturnoye Obozrenie**.

C2 Edited book, compilation, conference proceeding or special issue of journal

2006

Purhonen, S, Roos, JP (eds) **2006**, *Bourdieu ja minä: näkökulmia Pierre Bourdieun sosiologiaan*, **Vastapaino, Tampere**.

2007

Gronow, J, Rahkonen, K, Sinnemäki, A (eds) **2007**, *Small talkia sosiologiasta: kirjoituksia vuosilta 1995-2006*, **Tutkijaliitto, Helsinki**.

2008

Purhonen, S, Hoikkala, T, Roos, JP (eds) **2008**, *Kenen sukupolveen kuulut?: suurten ikäluokkien tarina*, **Gaudeamus, Helsinki**.

2009

Jaakkola, R, Kainulainen, S, Rahkonen, K (eds) **2009**, *Työväensuojelusta sosiaalipoliittikaan: Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys 1908-2008*, **Edita, Helsinki**.

2010

Ilmonen, K, Sulkunen, P (ed.), Rahkonen, K (ed.), Gronow, J (ed.), Noro, A, Warde, A (ed.) **2010**, *A Social and Economic Theory of Consumption*, translated by David Kivinen, **Palgrave Macmillan**.

Warde, A, Silva, E (eds) **2010**, *Cultural Analysis and the Legacy of Bourdieu: settling accounts and developing alternatives*, **Centre for Research on Socio-Economic Change Series, Routledge**.

Warde, A **2010**, *Cultural Consumption, Classification and Power*, **Routledge**.

Warde, A **2010**, *Consumption (Volumes I-IV)*, **Benchmarks in Culture and Society Series**, vol. I-IV, **SAGE, London**.

E1 Popular article, newspaper article

2006

Rahkonen, K **2006**, 'Tervetuloa yhteiskuntapolitiikan laitokselle, fuksit!', **Kajahdus**, no. 3, pp. 5-9.

Rahkonen, K **2006**, 'Yhteiskuntapolitiikka', **Tutkain : valtiotieteellisen tiedekunnan opiskelijajäläystäke**, no. 4, pp. 33.

2007

Rahkonen, K **2007**, '[Obituary]', **European sociologist.**, vol 26 Winter, pp. 8.

2008

Rahkonen, K **2008**, 'Cornix ja Stigma: sosiaalipoliittikan opiskelijoiden ainejärjestön syntyvaiheista', **Kajahdus**, no. 3, pp. 5-10.

E1 Popular contribution to book/other compilations

2005

Rahkonen, K **2005**, 'Kuluttajat hyvinvointipoliitikassa', **Puheenvuoroja. Kuluttajat, hyvinvointi ja kuluttajat -seminaari : 18.4.2005 Helsingin kauppakorkeakoulu.**, **Kulutustutkimuksen Seura, [Helsinki]**, pp. [5] s..



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

1 Analysis of activities 2005-2010

- Associated person is one of Jukka Gronow , Olga Gurova , Riie Heikkilä , Nina Kahma ,
Tuomo Laihiälä , Semi Purhonen , Keijo Rahkonen , Alan
Warde ,

Activity type	Count
Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis	9
Editor of research journal	13
Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings	2
Peer review of manuscripts	4
Membership or other role in review committee	1
Membership or other role in research network	5
Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board	16
Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization	9
Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation	4
Participation in interview for written media	31
Participation in radio programme	5
Participation in TV programme	1



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

2 Listing of activities 2005-2010

Supervisor or co-supervisor of doctoral thesis

Semi Purhonen ,

Väitöskirjatutkimuksen ohjaaja, Semi Purhonen, 2006 → 2011

Väitöskirjatutkimuksen ohjaaja, Semi Purhonen, 2006 → 2011

Väitöskirjatutkimuksen ohjaaja, Semi Purhonen, 2009 → ...

Keijo Rahkonen ,

Thesis Supervision, Keijo Rahkonen, 2007, Finland

Thesis supervision, Keijo Rahkonen, 2008, Finland

Thesis supervision, Keijo Rahkonen, 2010 → 2011, Finland

Thesis supervision, Keijo Rahkonen, 2010, Finland

Thesis supervision, Keijo Rahkonen, 2010 → 2011, Finland

Thesis supervision, Keijo Rahkonen, 2010, Finland

Editor of research journal

Jukka Gronow ,

Food, Culture and Society, Jukka Gronow, 2010 → ..., United States

Semi Purhonen ,

Toimituskunnan jäsen: Tiede & edistys, Semi Purhonen, 2010 → ...

Keijo Rahkonen ,

L'aventure humaine - Revue de la Nouvelle Encyclopédie Diderot, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, France

Tiede & edistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Tiede & edistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

L'aventure humaine - Revue de la Nouvelle Encyclopédie Diderot, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France

Tiede & edistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006

Tiede & edistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006

L'aventure humaine - Revue de la Nouvelle Encyclopédie Diderot, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France

Tiede & edistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

Janus, Keijo Rahkonen, 05.09.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Journal of Cultural Economy, Keijo Rahkonen, 18.06.2008 → 31.12.2008, United Kingdom

Sosiaalipoliittisen yhdistyksen 100-vuotishistoria, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Editor of research anthology/collection/conference proceedings

Semi Purhonen ,

Bourdieu ja minä: Näkökulmia Pierre Bourdieun sosiologiaan. (Vastapaino, Tampere, 2006.), Semi Purhonen, 01.09.2005 → 02.2006, Finland

Kenen sukupolveen kuulut? Suurten ikäluokkien tarina. (Gaudeamus, Helsinki, 2008.), Semi Purhonen, 01.2008 → 08.2008, Finland

Peer review of manuscripts

Semi Purhonen ,

Referee: Gaudeamus/Helsinki University Press, Semi Purhonen, 2008

Referee: Liikunta & Tiede, Semi Purhonen, 2009



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

Referee: Finnish Institute for Educational Research/University of Jyväskylä/Research Series, Semi Purhonen, 2010

Referee: Tiede & edistys, Semi Purhonen, 2010

Membership or other role in review committee

Semi Purhonen ,

Referee: United States - Israel Binational Science Foundation, Semi Purhonen, 12.2010 → 01.2011, Israel

Membership or other role in research network

Semi Purhonen ,

Network for the Studies of Cultural Distinctions and Social Differentiation (SCUD), Semi Purhonen, 2008 → 2011, Denmark

Keijo Rahkonen ,

Suunnittelutoimikunnan jäsen, Keijo Rahkonen, 2007 → ..., Finland

Jäsen/edustaja, Keijo Rahkonen, 2010, Finland

Puheenjohtaja, Keijo Rahkonen, 21.10.2010 → 22.10.2010, Finland

Varajohtaja, Keijo Rahkonen, 2010 → 2013, Finland

Membership or other role in national/international committee, council, board

Semi Purhonen ,

Helsingin yliopiston valtiotieteellisen tiedekunnan valintalautakunnan jäsen (sosiaalipoliitikan oppiaine), Semi Purhonen, 2005 → 2006

Helsingin yliopiston yhteiskuntapolitiikan laitoksen johtoryhmän varajäsen, Semi Purhonen, 15.06.2009 → 31.12.2009

Keijo Rahkonen ,

L'Association Diderot - Comité international, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, France

Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Helsingin yliopiston tieteellisen neuvoston asiantuntijapooli, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

L'Association Diderot - Comité international, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, France

Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistyksen 100-vuotishistoriatoimikunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

European Social Policy Analysis Net (ESPAnet), järjestelytoimikunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, Austria

European Sociological Association (ESA) Network of the Sociology of Consumption, 2008 Interim Meeting, järjestelytoimikunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

L'Association Diderot - Comité international, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007, France

Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007

European Social Policy Analysis Net (ESPAnet), järjestelytoimikunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Austria

European Sociological Association (ESA) Network of the Sociology of Consumption, 2008 Interim Meeting, järjestelytoimikunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, France

Network for the Studies of Cultural Distinctions and Social Differentiation, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Denmark

Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Membership or other role in public Finnish or international organization

Keijo Rahkonen ,

Helsingin yliopiston keskustakampuksen kirjastotoimikunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Kansaneläkelaitoksen tutkimusasiain neuvottelukunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland

Helsingin yliopiston keskustakampuksen kirjastotoimikunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland

Kansaneläkelaitoksen tutkimusasiain neuvottelukunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

Poliisiammattikorkeakoulu, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Helsingin yliopiston keskustakampuksen kirjastotoimikunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Kansaneläkelaitoksen tutkimusasiain neuvottelukunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Helsingin yliopiston keskustakampuksen kirjastotoimikunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland
Kansaneläkelaitoksen tutkimusasiain neuvottelukunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Membership or other role of body in private company/organisation

Keijo Rahkonen ,

Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2005 → 31.12.2005, Finland
Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistyksen työvaliokunta, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2006, Finland
Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys ry, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2007 → 31.12.2007
Sosiaalipoliittinen yhdistys ry, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2008 → 31.12.2008, Finland

Participation in interview for written media

Semi Purhonen ,

Lehtihaastattelu "Tutkija ei kuulu sukupolveen", Semi Purhonen, 05.05.2007
Lehtijuttu "60-luvun sukupolvi" ei edusta koko suurta ikäluokkaa", Semi Purhonen, 02.2007
Lehtijuttu "Radikaalit leimasivat 60-lukulaiset", Semi Purhonen, 05.05.2007
Lehtihaastattelu "Antaa tulla elämyksiä! Naiset kulttuuriretkillä", Semi Purhonen, 25.09.2008
Lehtihaastattelu "Antiradikaalit eivät juhl", Semi Purhonen, 31.08.2008
Lehtihaastattelu "Kivipesty vuosikymmen", Semi Purhonen, 08.2008
Lehtihaastattelu "Sinun täytyy astua johtoon", Semi Purhonen, 14.11.2008, Finland
Lehtijuttu "Sosiologinen teos analysoi suurten ikäluokkien elämänkulkuja", Semi Purhonen, 31.10.2008
Lehtijuttu "Yhtenäisen sukupolven harha", Semi Purhonen, 26.09.2008, Finland
Lehtihaastattelu "Ammattikorkeakoulut ohittivat lukiot", Semi Purhonen, 21.08.2009
Lehtihaastattelu "Generation Internet", Semi Purhonen, 02.04.2009
Lehtihaastattelu "Hyvän maun rajoilla", Semi Purhonen, 24.04.2009
Lehtihaastattelu "Haihtuvi nuoruus", Semi Purhonen, 19.09.2010
Lehtihaastattelu "Tuo ihana 00-luku", Semi Purhonen, 25.07.2010
Lehtihaastattelu "Ysärit tulevat", Semi Purhonen, 01.10.2010

Keijo Rahkonen ,

Image-lehti, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kaupunkilaiset utopiat 1 - Utopiat kulttuurimme pohjana, Helsingin yliopisto, Keijo Rahkonen, 09.02.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Studia generalia, Turun yliopisto, Historian laitos, Keijo Rahkonen, 21.03.2000 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehti: Kansan Utisten Viikkolehti, Keijo Rahkonen, 20.09.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Lehti: Yliopisto-lehti 20/2002, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tapahtuma: Foreign Correspondents Program 2002/Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Keijo Rahkonen, 07.08.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tilaisuus: Lions Club/Leijonien johtajuus- ja johtamiskoulutus, Keijo Rahkonen, 16.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tilaisuus: Valtiotieteellisen tiedekunnan OPPIMISYHTEISÖN keskustelutilaisuus, Keijo Rahkonen, 20.11.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Tilaisuus: Yhdyskuntasuunnittelun jatko- ja täydennyskoulutus (TKK), Keijo Rahkonen, 17.09.2002 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Journalisti-lehti 9/2006, Keijo Rahkonen, 01.01.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland
Kustantamo Vastapainon kirjanjulkistamistilaisuus, Sosiologipäivät, Tampereen yliopisto, Keijo Rahkonen, 24.03.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland



INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

RC-SPECIFIC TUHAT COMPILATIONS OF OTHER SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES 2005-2010

CulCap/Rahkonen

Valtiotieteellisen tiedekunnan kirjaston Kirjallinen salonki, Helsingin yliopisto, Keijo Rahkonen, 03.04.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Valtiotieteellisen tiedekunnan kirjaston Kirjallinen salonki, Helsingin yliopisto, Keijo Rahkonen, 16.10.2006 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Helsingin Sanomat Koulutusliite, Keijo Rahkonen, 27.02.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Sosiaalipolitiikan ja sosiaalityön aineyhdistys Stigma ry:n 50-vuosisjuhla, Keijo Rahkonen, 08.11.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Valtiosihteeri Risto Volasen järjestämä iltapäiväseminaari Königstedtin kartanossa, Keijo Rahkonen, 29.04.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Participation in radio programme

Nina Kahma ,

Tuomas Enbuske, YLE Radio 1, Nina Kahma, 18.11.2010, Finland

Semi Purhonen ,

Radiohaastattelu ohjelmassa "Villit vuodet, suuret ikäluokat", Semi Purhonen, 15.11.2008, Finland

Radiohaastattelu ohjelmassa "Ajantasa", Semi Purhonen, 18.09.2009

Radiohaastattelu ohjelmassa "Eve Mantu", Semi Purhonen, 10.06.2010

Keijo Rahkonen ,

Radioateljee/YLE Radio 1, Keijo Rahkonen, 11.07.2008 → 31.12.2011, Finland

Participation in TV programme

Semi Purhonen ,

Televisiohaastattelu ohjelmassa "K-Rappu", Semi Purhonen, 21.02.2006, Finland

Appendix B.b.

Maria Forsman, Chief Information Specialist, DSocSc
Helsinki University Library 7.7.2011

The bibliometric analyses by Helsinki University Library (HULib)

Background: The bibliometric analyses – especially citation analyses – have raised a lot of discussion and critics among researchers in social sciences and humanities. Researchers view that bibliometric analyses are often unfair to these fields of sciences because they do not give a good enough picture of the publishing. Citation databases – Web of Science and Scopus – cover only weakly the main publications in these fields. Also, in humanities and social sciences monograph is still the main form of publishing, and it does not include in these article databases.

At the University of Helsinki, the above mentioned concerns have been taken into account in the evaluation. The Evaluation Office has ordered analyses from the Helsinki University Library (HULib) for the participating researcher communities that are weakly represented in Web of Science. The database for the HULib analyses is TUHAT (<https://tuhat.halvi.helsinki.fi/portal/en/>) including all the publications that the researchers have considered important.

Based on this data, information specialists at HULib have carried out the following analyses:

- 1) Number of authors/publication/year as a table; a pie of authors/publication in the period 2005-2010;
- 2) Language of publication/year; a pie of language of publication in the period 2005-2010;
- 3) Articles/journal/year; journals have been compared by ISSN with the Norwegian, Australian and ERIH (2007-2008) journal ranking lists; number of articles in ranked journals;
- 4) Publisher/monograph type (according to TUHAT database); monographs have been compared with the Norwegian publisher ranking list. According to this, it has been counted how many monographs are published by a leading scientific publisher (2) or a scientific publisher (1).
- 5) Conference publications (from TUHAT database) especially in computer sciences; compared with the Australian conference ranking list.

Where relevant, some additional analyses and notes concerning the publication culture of a scientific field have been added. Overall, these analyses complement the other evaluation material and lists of the publications of the participating researcher communities.

If the publications of the RCs were less than 50 or/and the internal coverage less than 40 percentage, the WoS analyses were considered not reliable. These RCs were 58 altogether.

In addition, both Leiden and Library analyses were done to the RCs if WoS analyses covered less than 40 per cent of the peer review (A+C) publications of the RC. These RCs were 8 altogether.

The appendix includes the analyses of the RC under discussion.

**Analysis of publications by Helsinki University
Library – 66 RCs altogether**

Biological, Agricultural and Veterinary Sciences

Luukkanen, Olavi – VITRI
Valsta, Lauri – SUVALUE

Natural Sciences

Abrahamsson, Pekka – SOFTSYS
Kangasharju, Jussi – NODES
Ukkonen, Esko – ALKO
Väänänen, Jouko – HLG

Humanities

Aejmelaeus, Anneli – CSTT
Anttonen, Pertti – CMVG
Dunderberg, Ismo – FC
Havu, Eva – CoCoLaC
Heikkilä, Markku – RCSP
Heinämaa, Sara – SHC
Henriksson, Markku – CITA
Janhunen, Juha – LDHFTA
Kajava Mika, – AMNE
Klippi, Anu – Interaction
Knuuttila, Simo – PPMF
Koskenniemi, Kimmo – BAULT
Lauha, Aila – CECH
Lavento, Mika – ARCH-HU
Lukkarinen, Ville – AHCI
Lyytikäinen, Pirjo – GLW
Mauranen, Anna – LFP
Meinander, Henrik – HIST
Nevalainen, Terttu – VARIENG
Pettersson, Bo – ILLC
Pulkkinen, Tuija – Gender Studies
Pyrhönen, Heta – ART
Ruokanen, Miikka – RELDIAL
Saarinen, Risto – RELSOC
Sandu, Gabriel – LMPS
Tarasti, Eero – MusSig
Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri – TraST
Östman, Jan-Ola – LMS

Social Sciences

Airaksinen, Timo – PPH
Engeström, Yrjö – CRADLE
Granberg, Leo – TRANSRURBAN
Haila, Anne – Sociopolis
Hautamäki, Jarkko – CEA
Heinonen, Visa – KUMU
Helén, Ilpo – STS
Hukkinen, Janne – GENU
Jallinoja, Riitta – SBII
Kaartinen, Timo – SCA
Kettunen, Pauli – NordSoc
Kivinen, Markku – FCREES
Koponen, Juhani – DEVERELE
Koskenniemi, Martti – ECI
Kultti, Klaus – EAT
Lahelma, Elina – KUFÉ
Lanne, Markku – TSEM
Lavonen, Jari – RCMSE
Lehtonen, Risto – SocStats
Lindblom-Yläne, Sari – EdPsychHE
Nieminen, Hannu – MECOL
Nuotio, Kimmo – Law
Nyman, Göte – METEORI
Ollikainen, Markku – ENFIFO
Pirttilä-Backman, Anna-Maija – DYNASOBIC
Rahkonen, Keijo – CulCap
Roos, J P – HELPS
Simola, Hannu – SOCE-DGI
Sulkunen, Pekka – PosPus
Sumelius, John – AG ECON
Vaattovaara, Mari – STRUTSI
Vainio, Martti – SigMe

The next appendix includes the analyses of the
RC under discussion.

INTERNATIONAL EVALUATION OF RESEARCH AND DOCTORAL TRAINING AT THE UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI

22.6.2011/MF / 19.4.2012 MF


PUBLICATION DATA 2005-2010

RC/CulCap/Rahkonen

Category 4. *The research of the participating community represents an innovative opening.* A new opening can be an innovative combination of research fields, or it can be proven to have a special social, national or international demand or other significance. Even if the researcher community in its present composition has yet to obtain proof of international success, its members can produce convincing evidence of the high level of their previous research.

Number of authors in publications/year


Authors	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Grand Total
1 au	8	10	4	9	3	8	42
2 au		5	1	3	1	3	13
3 au		1	2	4	2	2	11
5 au					1		1
7 au						1	1
Grand Total	8	16	7	16	7	14	68



The number of authors in publications is mostly one (62%), but there are also 2 (10%) and 3 authors (16%).

Language of publication / Year

Language	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Grand Total
en_GB	2	2	3	2	4	10	23
fi_FI	4	10	4	13	3	4	38
ru_RU	1	4					5
sv_SE	1			1			2
Grand Total	8	16	7	16	7	14	68



Language of publications is mostly Finnish (56%) or English (34%). 7% is in Russian and 3% in Swedish.

Journal / Year / Total

Journals	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	Grand
Tiede & edistys		2		1	1	1	5
Sociologia	1			1	1	2	5
Istorik i khudozhnik		3					3
Sociologisk Forskning	1			1			2
Research on Finnish society				1	1		2
Nuorisotutkimus			1			1	2
Kajahdus		1		1			2
Yhteiskuntapolitiikka				1			1
Yhdyskuntasuunnittelu	1						1
Tutkain : valtiotieteellisen tiedekunnan opiskelijäläystäke		1					1
The Soviet and post-Soviet review		1					1
Sotsiologicheskii Issledovaniya	1						1
Sociological Review						1	1
Sociologica				1			1
Senses and Society		1					1
Poetics						1	1
Janus : sosiaalipolitiikan ja sosiaalityön tutkimuksen aikak		1					1
European sociologist.			1				1
Enterprise and Society		1					1
Baltic worlds : scholarly journal : news magazine						1	1
Grand Total	4	11	2	7	3	7	34

Journal ranking

Norway ranking

Level 2 = highest scientific, Level 1= scientific

Australian ranking

A*

Typically an A* journal would be one of the best in its field or subfield in which to publish and would typically cover the entire field/subfield. Virtually all papers they publish will be of a very high quality. These are journals where most of the work is important (it will really shape the field) and where researchers boast about getting accepted. Acceptance rates would typically be low and the editorial board would be dominated by field leaders, including many from top institutions.

A

The majority of papers in a Tier A journal will be of very high quality. Publishing in an A journal would enhance the author's standing, showing they have real engagement with the global research community and that they have something to say about problems of some significance. Typical signs of an A journal are lowish acceptance rates and an editorial board which includes a reasonable fraction of well known researchers from top institutions.

B

Tier B covers journals with a solid, though not outstanding, reputation. Generally, in a Tier B journal, one would expect only a few papers of very high quality. They are often important outlets for the work of PhD students and early career researchers. Typical examples would be regional journals with high acceptance rates, and editorial boards that have few leading researchers from top international institutions.

C

Tier C includes quality, peer reviewed, journals that do not meet the criteria of the higher tiers.

ERIH ranking 2007-2008

Purpose of The European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH) is to develop and to maintain an impact assessment tool for European research journals. Journal classification processes are conducted by discipline-specific expert panels. In the ERIH 2007 Initial List there are three categories:

A = international publications, both European and non-European, with high visibility and influence among researchers in the various research domains in different countries, regularly cited all over the world.

B = international publications, both European and non-European, with significant visibility and influence in the various research domains in different countries.

C = European publications with a recognized scholarly significance among researchers in the respective research domains in a particular readership group in Europe; occasionally cited outside the publishing country, though the main target group is the domestic academic community.

	Journals	Grand Total	Norway	Australia	ERIH History (2007)	ERIH History (2008)	ERIH Literature (2008)	ERIH Art, Architectural and Design History (2008)
Sociologisk Forskning		2	1	C				
Enterprise and Society		1	2	B	A			
Poetics		1	2	A			A	
Senses and Society		1	1	B		B		
Sociological Review		1	2	A				
Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya		1	1	C				
The Soviet and post-Soviet review		1	1					
Grand Total		8						

Amount of ranked articles (Norway)

Norway	Journal articles
Level 2	3
Level 1	5

Amount of ranked articles (Australian)

Australia	Journal articles
Level A*	0
Level A	2
Level B	2
Level C	3

The research group has published 34 articles. 5 articles are published in **Sosiologia** that is the main journal of Finnish sociologists, although it does not include in international ranking lists. Also 5 articles are published in **Tiede ja edistys** (Science and progress) that is a forum of theoretical discussions in social sciences, not including in ranking lists.

Publisher ranking (based on Norwegian ranking list)

2 = leading scientific

1 =scientific

no = non-scientific or not ranked

Publishers	c2_edited_book_compilation_conferenceproceedings_special	Grand Total	Publisher ranking
Edita	1	1	1
Gaudeamus	1	1	1
Palgrave Macmillan	1	1	2
Routledge	2	2	2
SAGE	1	1	2
Tutkijaliitto	1	1	1
Vastapaino	1	1	1
Grand Total	8	8	

The research group has published 8 books that are all edited books. They are also published by ranked scientific publishers: 4 books are published by a leading scientific publisher and 4 by a scientific publisher.

University of Helsinki
Administrative Publications 80/129
Evaluations

ISBN 978-952-10-7549-0 (PDF)
ISSN 1795-5513 (Online)

Internet address:

http://www.helsinki.fi/julkaisut/aineisto/rc_evaluation2012/hallinnon_julkaisuja_80_129_2012.pdf



HELSINGIN YLIOPISTO
HELSINGFORS UNIVERSITET
UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI